HEPHY-PUB 941/14
UWThPh-2014-23
October 2014

arXiv:1410.5241v1 [hep-ph] 20 Oct 2014

THE SPINLESS RELATIVISTIC YUKAWA PROBLEM

Wolfgang LUCHA[*]

Institute for High Energy Physics,
Austrian Academy of Sciences,
Nikolsdorfergasse 18, A-1050 Vienna, Austria

Franz F. SCHÖBERL[†]

Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna,
Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria

Abstract

Noticing renewed or increasing interest in the possibility to describe semirelativistic bound states (of either spin-zero constituents or, upon confining oneself to spin-averaged features, constituents with nonzero spin) by means of the spinless Salpeter equation generalizing the Schrödinger equation towards incorporation of effects caused by relativistic kinematics, we revisit this problem for interactions between bound-state constituents of Yukawa shape, by recalling and applying several well-known tools enabling to constrain the resulting spectra.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Pm, 03.65.Ge, 12.39.Pn, 11.10.St

Keywords: relativistic bound states, Bethe–Salpeter formalism, spinless Salpeter equation, Rayleigh–Ritz variational technique, Yukawa potential

[*] *E-mail address*: wolfgang.lucha@oeaw.ac.at
[†] *E-mail address*: franz.schoeberl@univie.ac.at

1 Introduction: Describing Relativistic Bound States

The *spinless Salpeter equation*, frequently employed for a quantum-theoretic description of semirelativistic bound states, is the eigenvalue equation of a Hamiltonian H combining the relativistic free energy T of the bound-state constituents with some interaction potential V. It is encountered as penultimate step (the ultimate step being the Schrödinger equation) in the course of a nonrelativistic reduction of the homogeneous Bethe–Salpeter equation [1–3] as the Lorentz-covariant quantum-field-theoretic approach to bound states. For a system of two particles of equal masses m, relative momentum $\boldsymbol{p}$, and relative coordinate $\boldsymbol{x}$, H reads[1]

$$H \equiv T(\boldsymbol{p}) + V(\boldsymbol{x}) \;, \qquad T(\boldsymbol{p}) \equiv 2\,\sqrt{\boldsymbol{p}^2 + m^2} \;. \tag{1}$$

The hardly avoidable nonlocality of H inhibits to find the exact eigensolutions analytically.

In this study, we revisit what we call the spinless relativistic Yukawa problem, posed by allowing V to be the Yukawa potential, a short-range, spherically symmetric potential (i.e., $V = V(r)$, $r \equiv |\boldsymbol{x}|$) with coupling strength y and shape determined by a range parameter b:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}) = V_{\mathrm{Y}}(r) \equiv -y\,\frac{\exp(-b\,r)}{r} \;, \qquad b > 0 \;, \qquad y \geq 0 \;. \tag{2}$$

Owing to the fact that it may be understood to arise from the exchange of a single mediator of mass b between interacting particles, this potential is of paramount importance for many subareas of physics. Like its limit for $b \to 0$, the Coulomb potential, V_{Y} is singular at $r = 0$. Our goal is to derive *rigorous* constraints on the resulting eigensolutions by standard tools.

2 Energy Bounds for the Spinless Salpeter Equation

Semiboundedness of a linear operator may be established, possibly, by comparison. For any semibounded operator, the coarse location of its eigenvalues can be restricted variationally. Both lower and upper spectral limits may by found by a tool dubbed envelope theory [4–8].

2.1 Various Upper Bounds

For bound states described by the spinless Salpeter equation, a couple of results of different origin for upper limits to energy levels have been derived: some of rather trivial nature, e.g., those emerging from the corresponding Schrödinger problem; or those subsumed under the notion of (appropriately constructed) envelope theory; or those arising from the variational characterization of eigenvalues of operators provided by the minimum–maximum theorem.

2.1.1 Nonrelativistic Kinematics: Straightforward Schrödinger Upper Bound

Both the concavity of the square root in the relativistic kinetic energy $T(\boldsymbol{p})$ considered as a function of $\boldsymbol{p}^2$ and, for self-adjoint $T(\boldsymbol{p})$, the operator inequality [9] $[T(\boldsymbol{p}) - 2\,m]^2 \geq 0$ yield

$$T(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq 2\,m + \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{m} \;.$$

So, our spinless-Salpeter Hamiltonian H and its nonrelativistic limit, H_{NR}, must satisfy the operator relation $H \leq H_{\mathrm{NR}}$ and their eigenvalues E_k and $E_{k,\mathrm{NR}}$, respectively, the inequality $E_k \leq E_{k,\mathrm{NR}}$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. This entails that the total number N of spinless-Salpeter bound states will not be less than the number N_{NR} of Schrödinger bound states: $N \geq N_{\mathrm{NR}}$.

[1] To simplify notation, we use units natural in relativistic quantum theory or particle physics: $\hbar = c = 1$.

2.1.2 Relativistic Kinematics: Variational Upper Limits by Rayleigh and Ritz

As consequence of the minimum–maximum theorem [10–12], the Rayleigh–Ritz variational tool takes advantage of the fact that the lowest-lying d eigenvalues E_k, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1$, ordered according to $E_0 \leq E_1 \leq E_2 \leq \cdots$ of a self-adjoint operator H bounded from below (if still all situated below the onset of the essential spectrum of H) are bounded from above by the d similarly ordered eigenvalues $\widehat{E}_k$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$, of the operator H restricted to a d-dimensional trial subspace of the domain of H: $E_k \leq \widehat{E}_k$ for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$, which allows us to localize eigenvalues by upper bounds of increasing tightness [13,14] for rising d.

We find and have always found [15–24] it advantageous to span these finite-dimensional variational trial subspaces by a basis the representations of which are known analytically in both configuration and momentum space (related, of course, by Fourier transformation): in this case, the expectation values of H may be analytically given by evaluating those of $T(\boldsymbol{p})$ in momentum space and those of $V(\boldsymbol{x})$ in configuration space. By spherical symmetry, each basis vector factorizes into the product of a radial part and a spherical harmonic $\mathcal{Y}_{\ell m}(\Omega)$ for angular momentum ℓ and projection m depending on the solid angle Ω. Our (orthonormal) configuration-space basis vectors use generalized-Laguerre orthogonal polynomials [25,26]:

$$\phi_{k,\ell m}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{(2\,\mu)^{2\ell+2\beta+1}\,k!}{\Gamma(2\,\ell+2\,\beta+k+1)}}\,|\boldsymbol{x}|^{\ell+\beta-1}\exp(-\mu\,|\boldsymbol{x}|)\,L_k^{(2\ell+2\beta)}(2\,\mu\,|\boldsymbol{x}|)\,\mathcal{Y}_{\ell m}(\Omega_{\boldsymbol{x}})\ ,$$

$$L_k^{(\gamma)}(x) \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k+\gamma}{k-t}\frac{(-x)^t}{t!}\ , \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\ , \qquad \mu \in (0,\infty)\ , \qquad \beta \in \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \infty\right).$$

Our momentum-space basis vectors involve the hypergeometric function, $F(u, v; w; z)$ [25]:

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\phi}_{k,\ell m}(\boldsymbol{p}) = {} & \sqrt{\frac{(2\,\mu)^{2\ell+2\beta+1}\,k!}{\Gamma(2\,\ell+2\,\beta+k+1)}}\,\frac{(-\mathrm{i})^\ell\,|\boldsymbol{p}|^\ell}{2^{\ell+1/2}\,\Gamma\left(\ell+\frac{3}{2}\right)} \\ & \times\sum_{t=0}^{k}\frac{(-1)^t}{t!}\binom{k+2\,\ell+2\,\beta}{k-t}\frac{\Gamma(2\,\ell+\beta+t+2)\,(2\,\mu)^t}{(\boldsymbol{p}^2+\mu^2)^{(2\ell+\beta+t+2)/2}} \\ & \times F\left(\frac{2\,\ell+\beta+t+2}{2}, -\frac{\beta+t}{2}; \ell+\frac{3}{2}; \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{\boldsymbol{p}^2+\mu^2}\right)\mathcal{Y}_{\ell m}(\Omega_{\boldsymbol{p}})\ , \\ F(u,v;w;z) \equiv {} & \frac{\Gamma(w)}{\Gamma(u)\,\Gamma(v)}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(u+n)\,\Gamma(v+n)}{\Gamma(w+n)}\,\frac{z^n}{n!}\ .\end{aligned}$$

2.2 Coulomb Lower Bounds to the Relativistic Yukawa Problem

Since $\exp(-b\,r) \leq 1$, the potential (2) is bounded from below by the Coulomb potential V_{C}:

$$V_{\mathrm{C}}(r) \equiv -\frac{\kappa}{r} \leq -y\,\frac{\exp(-b\,r)}{r} \equiv V_{\mathrm{Y}}(r) \qquad \text{for} \qquad y \leq \kappa\ .$$

For the relativistic Coulomb problem, various rigorous lower limits have been given [27,28]:

- Disregarding domain questions, the Hamiltonian (1) with Coulomb potential $V_{\mathrm{C}}(r)$ is essentially self-adjoint for $\kappa \leq 1$, with Friedrichs extension up to the critical coupling

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{c}} = \frac{4}{\pi} = 1.273239\ldots\ ,$$

and, if $\kappa < \kappa_{\rm c}$, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian H, $\sigma(H)$, is bounded from below [27]:

$$\sigma(H) \geq 2\,m\,\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_{\rm c}}\right)^2} = 2\,m\,\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{\pi\,\kappa}{4}\right)^2}\ . \tag{3}$$

- For a restricted range of coupling constants, the spectral bound can be improved [28]:

$$\sigma(H) \geq 2\,m\,\sqrt{\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\kappa^2}}{2}} \qquad \text{for} \qquad \kappa \leq 1\ . \tag{4}$$

Clearly, even on dimensional grounds the bounds (3) and (4) have to scale with the mass m. So, (at least) for $y \leq \kappa_{\rm c}$, the operator (1) with Yukawa potential (2) is bounded from below. Hence, the minimum–maximum theorem applies and using variational methods is justified.

3 Relativistic Yukawa Problem: General Constraints

Further, more Yukawa-specific issues worth consideration are the allowed number of bound states (well-defined in the Schrödinger case) or the existence of a critical coupling constant.

3.1 Rigorous Limit on the Number of Schrödinger Bound States

The nonrelativistic Yukawa problem can accommodate only a finite total number of bound states. A rather simple upper limit to this number $N_{\rm NR}$ has been derived by Bargmann [29]:

$$N_{\rm NR} \lneqq \frac{I\,(I+1)}{2}\ , \qquad I \equiv m\int\limits_0^\infty {\rm d}r\,r\,|V_{\rm Y}(r)| = \frac{m\,y}{b}\ .$$

3.2 Boundedness from Below: Constraint on Coupling Constant

The singularity at the origin ($r = 0$) of the Yukawa potential $V_{\rm Y}(r)$ resembles the one of the Coulomb potential $V_{\rm C}(r)$. Therefore, also for the relativistic Yukawa problem the existence of a ground state (or, in other words, of a finite eigenvalue $E_0 > -\infty$ of the Hamiltonian H) requires the overall coupling constant in this potential to be bounded from above. Since, by Rayleigh's principle, which is nothing but the minimum–maximum principle for trial-space dimension $d = 1$, any expectation value $\langle H\rangle$ of H forms an upper limit to the bottom of the spectrum of H, demanding $\langle H\rangle$ to be finite, $\langle H\rangle > -\infty$, restricts the allowable couplings y. An analytic limit is found by use of the simplest of our basis states ($k = \ell = m = 0$, $\beta = 1$),

$$\phi_{0,00}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{\mu^3}{\pi}}\exp(-\mu\,|\boldsymbol{x}|)\ , \qquad \widetilde{\phi}_{0,00}(\boldsymbol{p}) = \frac{\sqrt{8\,\mu^5}}{\pi}\,\frac{1}{(\boldsymbol{p}^2+\mu^2)^2}\ , \tag{5}$$

yielding, for the expectation values of kinetic energy $T(\boldsymbol{p})$ [24] and Yukawa potential $V_{\rm Y}(r)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle T(\boldsymbol{p})\rangle &= \frac{4}{3\,\pi\,(m^2-\mu^2)^{5/2}} \\ &\quad\times\left[\mu\,\sqrt{m^2-\mu^2}\,(3\,m^4-4\,m^2\,\mu^2+4\,\mu^4)+3\,m^4\,(m^2-2\,\mu^2)\,\sec^{-1}\!\left(\frac{m}{\mu}\right)\right], \\ \langle V_{\rm Y}(r)\rangle &= -\frac{4\,y\,\mu^3}{(b+2\,\mu)^2}\ .\end{aligned}$$

We must inspect the limit $\mu \to \infty$, where our trial state (5) gets concentrated to the spatial origin, $r = 0$. In this case, $\langle H \rangle = \langle T(\boldsymbol{p}) \rangle + \langle V_{\mathrm{Y}}(r) \rangle$ becomes, by its expansion about $\mu = \infty$,

$$\langle H \rangle = \left(\frac{16}{3\,\pi} - y \right) \mu + y\,b + \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\frac{16\,m^2}{3\,\pi} - \frac{3\,y\,b^2}{4} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu^2} \right) \xrightarrow[\mu \to \infty]{} -\infty \qquad \text{for} \qquad y > \frac{16}{3\,\pi} \,.$$

Any coupling y large enough that the coefficient in the $O(\mu)$ term is negative will inevitably cause collapse. To avoid this, we impose the constraint (improvable by larger dimensions d)

$$y \leq \frac{16}{3\,\pi} = 1.69765\ldots \,.$$

This constraint does not depend on the Yukawa range b. It thus holds without modification also for the limit $b \to 0$ of the Yukawa potential, the Coulomb potential. There, of course, it cannot be as tight as the optimum constraint $\kappa < \kappa_{\mathrm{c}}$ by Herbst (cf. Ref. [27, Theorem 2.1]).

4 Application: Tentative Approximate Eigensolution

Upon specifying the numerical values of the parameters of the theory, the various concepts, findings, and techniques introduced in Secs. 2 and 3 may now be imposed on the relativistic Yukawa problem. We are aware of only two recently published investigations of the spinless Salpeter equation with Yukawa potential [30,31], both of them aiming at finding (of course, just approximate) analytical solutions by replacing this bound-state equation by a "pseudo spinless Salpeter equation," a — by standard methods solvable — Schrödinger-like implicit eigenvalue equation, fabricated by expansion of the relativistic free energy $T(\boldsymbol{p})$ up to order $\boldsymbol{p}^4/m^4$ and a perturbative treatment of the $O(\boldsymbol{p}^4)$ term spoiling the semiboundedness of H.

For ease of comparison, we prefer to adopt the tools prepared beforehand within a setup that has been discussed already in earlier investigations. Among the two studies mentioned above, Ref. [30] presents more details. So, let's employ also here the set of parameter values used in Ref. [30], that is, $m = 5$ fm^{-1} for the common mass of the bound-state constituents, $y = 1$ for the Yukawa coupling constant, and three different choices for the Yukawa range b. For the envisaged comparison of outcomes, we opt for the largest among these three values, $b = 0.01$ fm^{-1}: this choice clearly entails the largest deviation of the Yukawa potential from the Coulomb case realized for $b = 0$. The value $y = 1$ respects the bound derived in Sec. 3.2:

$$y = 1 < \frac{16}{3\,\pi} = 1.69765\ldots \,.$$

Even the value $b = 0.01$ fm^{-1} is, however, so small that the Yukawa problem under study is still close enough to its Coulomb limiting case that the upper limit on the number of bound states of the nonrelativistic Yukawa problem given in Sec. 3.1 is fairly large: $N_{\mathrm{NR}} < 125250$.

The Coulomb lower limits on the relativistic Yukawa spectrum require $\kappa \geq y$ (Sec. 2.2). The smallest allowed Coulomb coupling $\kappa = y = 1$ then constrains the lowest eigenvalue by

$$\frac{E_0}{m} \geq \frac{\sqrt{16 - \pi^2}}{2} = 1.23798\ldots \quad \text{(Ref. [27])} \,, \qquad \frac{E_0}{m} \geq \sqrt{2} = 1.41421\ldots \quad \text{(Ref. [28])} \,.$$

Letting $m = 5$ fm^{-1} thus implies, as lower bounds to the ground-state energy eigenvalue E_0 or the associated binding energy, $B_0 \equiv E_0 - 2\,m$, respectively, from Eq. (3), $E_0 \geq 6.19$ fm^{-1} and $B_0 \geq -3.81$ fm^{-1} and, by the improvement (4), $E_0 \geq 7.07$ fm^{-1} and $B_0 \geq -2.93$ fm^{-1}.

For the *lowest* bound states (labelled by the number of zeros of the radial wave function n_r and the angular momentum ℓ) of the relativistic Yukawa problem, both upper bounds of Sec. 2 on the *binding* energies $B_k \equiv E_k - 2\,m$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, d-1$, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Upper limits on the binding energies of the (actually) lowest bound-state solutions of the spinless Salpeter equation with Yukawa potential, for the parameters of Ref. [30]: the Laguerre bounds $\overline{B}$ of Sec. 2.1.2 and the Schrödinger bounds $\overline{B}_{\mathrm{NR}}$ of Sec. 2.1.1. Each bound state is identified by both its radial quantum number n_r and its orbital angular momentum quantum number ℓ. Just as a starting point, we keep the dimension d of the variational trial space D_d and both variational parameters μ and β fixed to the values $d = 25$, $\mu = 1$, $\beta = 1$.

Bound state		Spinless Salpeter equation	Schrödinger equation
n_r	ℓ	$\overline{B}(n_r, \ell)$ $\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$	$\overline{B}_{\mathrm{NR}}(n_r, \ell)$ $\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$
0	0	−1.62087	−1.24002
0	1	−0.31432	−0.30259
0	2	−0.13085	−0.12909
0	3	−0.06895	−0.06847
0	4	−0.04070	−0.04052
0	5	−0.02555	−0.02546
0	6	−0.01683	−0.01649
1	0	−0.37016	−0.30262
1	1	−0.13413	−0.12913
1	2	−0.06958	−0.06853
1	3	−0.04094	−0.04060
1	4	−0.02570	−0.02555
1	5	−0.01669	−0.01659
1	6	−0.01127	−0.01089
2	0	−0.15029	−0.12915
2	1	−0.07098	−0.06857
2	2	−0.04128	−0.04065
2	3	−0.02585	−0.02562
2	4	−0.01680	−0.01667
2	5	−0.01095	−0.01099
2	6	−0.00685	−0.00721
3	0	−0.07764	−0.06858
3	1	−0.04201	−0.04069
3	2	−0.02606	−0.02567
3	3	−0.01690	−0.01674
3	4	−0.01098	−0.01107
3	5	−0.00734	−0.00730
3	6	−0.00212	−0.00471
4	0	−0.04535	−0.04071
4	1	−0.02649	−0.02570
4	2	−0.01704	−0.01679
4	3	−0.01097	−0.01113
4	4	−0.00646	−0.00737
4	5	−0.00134	−0.00479

Table 1, continued.

Bound state		Spinless Salpeter equation	Schrödinger equation
n_r	ℓ	$\overline{B}(n_r,\ell)\,\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$	$\overline{B}_{\mathrm{NR}}(n_r,\ell)\,\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$
5	0	−0.02839	−0.02572
5	1	−0.01730	−0.01682
5	2	−0.01094	−0.01117
5	3	−0.00531	−0.00743
6	0	−0.01848	−0.01684
6	1	−0.01087	−0.01121
6	2	−0.00438	−0.00747
7	0	−0.01151	−0.01122
7	1	−0.00349	−0.00750
8	0	−0.00363	−0.00752

A brief comparison of the upper energy bounds listed in Table 1 with the corresponding numerical results presented in Tables 1 and 2 of Ref. [30] reveals a few unexpected features, which clearly affects one's assessment of the reliability of the approach followed in Ref. [30]:

- For pretty unclear reasons, the *ground state* of the pseudo spinless Salpeter equation, studied in Ref. [30], characterized by vanishing radial and orbital angular momentum quantum numbers, i.e., $n_r = \ell = 0$, is missing in both Table 1 and Table 2 of Ref. [30]. As a matter of fact, in each sector of given angular momentum ℓ the (nodeless) bound system with radial quantum number $n_r = 0$ didn't make it into the study of Ref. [30]. Hence, for the sake of completeness, comparability and compatibility with our results for the upper energy limits, Table 2 discloses the binding energies of all $n_r = 0$ bound states accommodated by the pseudo spinless-Salpeter equation in Eq. (4) of Ref. [30].

Table 2: Binding energies $B_{\mathrm{p}}(n_r = 0, \ell)$ of the set of true ground states within each sector of given orbital angular momentum ℓ, emerging from the "pseudo spinless Salpeter equation" used in Ref. [30] (Eq. (4) of Ref. [30]), localized by unbiased solution of Eq. (14) of Ref. [30].

ℓ	$B_{\mathrm{p}}(n_r=0,\ell)\,\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$	ℓ	$B_{\mathrm{p}}(n_r=0,\ell)\,\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$	ℓ	$B_{\mathrm{p}}(n_r=0,\ell)\,\left[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}\right]$
0	−2.91894	5	−0.02552	10	−0.00275
1	−0.31469	6	−0.01653	11	−0.00156
2	−0.13084	7	−0.01083	12	−0.00078
3	−0.06893	8	−0.00706	13	−0.00030
4	−0.04068	9	−0.00451	14	−0.00006

- Assuming the numerical results reproduced in Tables 1 and 2 of Ref. [30] to be quoted in units of fm^{-1}, for nonvanishing orbital angular momentum quantum number $\ell > 0$ some energy levels of Ref. [30] violate more or less severely the limits given in Table 1: recall that increasing the dimension d of one's trial space may lower and thus improve variational upper limits, so any such discrepancy is doomed to become more virulent.

- Moreover, in Ref. [30] a regrettably not successful attempt was made to recover, from the approximate analytic solution to the pseudo spinless Salpeter equation subsumed by Eqs. (14) and (19) of Ref. [30], the associated solution for the nonrelativistic limit, by wiping out in these expressions all traces of that notorious $O(\boldsymbol{p}^4)$ free-energy term:

  - For a Yukawa coupling constant being equal to unity, $y = 1$, Eq. (14) of Ref. [30] simplifies to a linear relation from which the binding energies B_p can be read off:

$$B_\mathrm{p}(n_r, \ell) = -\frac{\left[m - 2\left(n_r + \ell + 1\right)^2 b\right]^2}{4\left(n_r + \ell + 1\right)^2 m} \qquad (y = 1) \ .$$

  - For Yukawa coupling constants different from unity ($y \neq 1$), Eq. (14) of Ref. [30] yields an equation quadratic in the energy B_p, with two roots easily worked out. The existence of *real* solutions for B_p at all depends on the involved parameters.

  The asserted result given in Eq. (21) of Ref. [30] matches, however, none of the above. Clearly, all such findings have to be confronted with the numerical solution [32] of the Schrödinger equation with Yukawa potential listed in the fourth column of Table 1.

- The involvement of the Yukawa range parameter b in a change of variables required in the course of derivation of the set of approximate solutions offered in Ref. [30] renders these solutions for eigenvalues and eigenfunctions rather doubtful for several reasons:

  - The nonrelativistic binding energies B_p arising from Eq. (14) of Ref. [30] for the case of arbitrary $y \neq 1$ exhibit a peculiar dependence $B_\mathrm{p}(b)$ on this parameter b: *Both* of these eigenvalue solutions vanish in the (Coulomb-type) limit $b \to 0$ and decrease, for large values of b (in the limit $b \to \infty$), like $B_\mathrm{p}(b) \propto b^2$; thus, at least for sufficiently large b, they both predict $B_\mathrm{p}(b_2) < B_\mathrm{p}(b_1)$ for $b_1 < b_2$, in contrast to theory-guided intuition, and they violate the Coulomb lower limit of Sec. 2.2.
  - The limit $b \to 0$ reproduces the nonrelativistic Coulomb levels merely for $y = 1$.

By the above observations, we are led to conclude that the bulk of approximations imposed on the spinless Salpeter equation in order to arrive at approximate semianalytical solutions — encoded in an implicit relation providing the bound-state energies (Eq. (14) of Ref. [30]) and an explicit expression for the associated eigenfunctions (Eq. (19) of Ref. [30]) — lead to unsatisfactory, or poor, characterizations of the spectrum of the spinless Salpeter equation.

5 Summary and Concluding Remarks

With due satisfaction, we realize that we have at our disposal a variety of sophisticated and highly efficient techniques that enable us to draw a sufficiently clear picture of the solutions to be expected for the spinless Salpeter equation. With these rigorous boundary conditions at hand, we are able to subject a proposed approximate solution to a detailed scrutiny with respect to its trustability. It is a pity that not all findings for the Yukawa case pass this test.

References

[1] H. A. Bethe and E. E. Salpeter, Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 309.

[2] M. Gell-Mann and F. Low, Phys. Rev. **84** (1951) 350.

[3] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. **84** (1951) 1232.

[4] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha, and F. F. Schöberl, J. Phys. A **34** (2001) 5059, arXiv:hep-th/0012127.

[5] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha, and F. F. Schöberl, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001) 5228, arXiv:hep-th/0101223.

[6] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha, and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **17** (2002) 1931, arXiv:hep-th/0110220.

[7] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha, and F. F. Schöberl, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 5913, arXiv:math-ph/0208042.

[8] R. L. Hall, W. Lucha, and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **18** (2003) 2657, arXiv:hep-th/0210149.

[9] A. Martin, Phys. Lett. B **214** (1988) 561.

[10] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators* (Academic Press, New York, 1978).

[11] A. Weinstein and W. Stenger, *Methods of Intermediate Problems for Eigenvalues — Theory and Ramifications* (Academic Press, New York/London, 1972).

[12] W. Thirring, *A Course in Mathematical Physics 3: Quantum Mechanics of Atoms and Molecules* (Springer, New York/Wien, 1990).

[13] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Rev. A **60** (1999) 5091, arXiv:hep-ph/9904391.

[14] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 3221, arXiv:hep-ph/9909451.

[15] W. Lucha, H. Rupprecht, and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 1233.

[16] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum*, edited by N. Brambilla and G. M. Prosperi (World Scientific, River Edge, NJ, 1995) p. 100, arXiv:hep-ph/9410221.

[17] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Lett. B **387** (1996) 573, arXiv:hep-ph/9607249.

[18] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Rev. A **56** (1997) 139, arXiv:hep-ph/9609322.

[19] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **14** (1999) 2309, arXiv:hep-ph/9812368.

[20] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Fizika B **8** (1999) 193, arXiv:hep-ph/9812526.

[21] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Recent Res. Dev. Phys. **5** (2004) 1423, arXiv:hep-ph/0408184.

[22] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29** (2014) 1450057, arXiv:1401.5970 [hep-ph].

[23] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, arXiv:1407.4624 [hep-ph].

[24] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, arXiv:1408.4957 [hep-ph], Int. J. Mod. Phys. A (in press).

[25] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1964).

[26] Bateman Manuscript Project, A. Erdélyi et al., *Higher Transcendental Functions* (McGraw–Hill, New York, 1953), Vol. II.

[27] I. W. Herbst, Commun. Math. Phys. **53** (1977) 285; **55** (1977) 316 (addendum).

[28] A. Martin and S. M. Roy, Phys. Lett. B **233** (1989) 407.

[29] V. Bargmann, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **38** (1952) 961.

[30] M. Hamzavi, S. M. Ikhdair, and M. Solaimani, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **21** (2012) 1250016, arXiv:1203.1747 [quant-ph] (various mistakes in the printed publication have been corrected, later on, in arXiv:1203.1747v2 [quant-ph]).

[31] S. Hassanabadi, M. Ghominejad, S. Zarrinkamar, and H. Hassanabadi, Chin. Phys. B **22** (2013) 060303.

[32] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **10** (1999) 607, arXiv:hep-ph/9811453.